

REMARKS

Claims 1-79 were presented for examination. In an Office action dated January 25, 2008, claims 1-79 were rejected.

Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address the Examiner's comments below. Based on following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) In View of Davies and Klotz

In the 4th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 1-6, 19, 20, 27-32, 35-49, 54-55, 59-68, and 73-74 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0085759 ("Davies") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,682,540 (Klotz). This rejection is now traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites:

A computer-implemented method for processing a stored document, comprising:
receiving an image of a document index, *the document index comprising a plurality of graphic representations of documents, wherein each graphic representation uniquely identifies a document*;
locating, on the document index image, at least a first graphic representation of a first stored document;
locating, on the document index image, an image of a first sticker specifying an action;
determining that the first sticker specifies a first action be performed on the first stored document based on a location of the first sticker with respect to the first graphic representation; and
performing the first action to cause a change to the first stored document.

The remaining independent claims 42, 44 and 63 recite elements similar to those above for Claim 1.

These aspects of the claimed invention pertain to the manipulation of collection of stored documents without requiring users to interact with a user interface or a hardware device. The method is based on adhering stickers specifying actions proximate to graphic representations of the stored documents in a document index. An image of the document index, which includes a plurality of graphic representations of the documents, is received. The graphic representation of the documents allow for fast and easy identification of the document by providing a snapshot view of a particular documents. The graphic representations of documents and stickers are located by the image reader independently. A sticker specifying an action on a document is determined based the location of the sticker with respect to the location of a graphic representation of a document. The ability to manipulate collections of different electronically stored documents/files based on adhering stickers on a hardcopy document image provides a level of facility in document manipulation using hard-copy documents not possible or suggested by the art of record.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references considered alone or in the combination proposed by the Examiner. Specifically, Davies does not disclose “determining that the first sticker specifies a first action to be performed on the first stored document based on a location of the first sticker with respect to the first graphic representation.”

The Examiner states that

Davies et al. teach that while the user interface tag of the invention is illustrated in FIG.1 as an adhesive sticker capable of being applied to documents, it should be observed that the pattern may also be applied to cover sheet capable of being associated with a document (paragraph block 0035), which meet the limitation of determining that the first sticker specifies a first action to be performed on

the first stored document based on the location of the first sticker with respect to the first graphic representation.

Office Action dated January 25, 2008, page. 3.

Davies merely discloses a one step system of identifying tags adhered to single hardcopy documents for which they specify actions. Davies also discloses a system of identifying tags adhered to cover sheets capable of being associated with single hard copy documents for which they specify actions. However, this is not the same as the additional step to determine the documents for which the stickers specify actions based on a location of the sticker with respect to the first graphic representation, and as such, Davies does not teach determining the documents for which the stickers specify action based on the sticker's location. The document index, as claimed in the present application, includes multiple graphic representations of different documents. Stickers are adhered proximate to the graphic representations of the stored documents. Graphic representations of documents and stickers are located by the image reader independently. A sticker specifying an action on a document is determined based on a location of the sticker with respect to the location of a graphic representation of a document. Therefore, determining the documents for which the stickers specify actions is based on the location of the sticker. For at least the reasons stated above, Davies does not teach or suggest "determining that the first sticker specifies a first action to be performed on the first stored document based on a location of the first sticker with respect to the first graphic representation."

Klotz does not remedy the deficiencies of Davies. Klotz also does not show "determining that the first sticker specifies a first action to be performed on the first stored document based on a location of the first sticker with respect to the first graphic

representation.” Klotz merely describes a selection box as a way for a user to select a subset of documents. The selection box in Klotz is merely a square check box in which a mark can be placed in order to indicate selection of the corresponding document. The selection box in Klotz appears at a defined location in the document.

The Examiner admits that Davies does not show “receiving an image of a document index, the document index comprising a plurality of graphic representations of documents, wherein each graphic representation uniquely identifies a document.” *See Office Action*, page 3. The Examiner states that

Klotz, Jr. et al. teach that document surrogate 80, as depicted, contains summaries of four different documents. Each document summary contains document selection box 82, first window 84, and second window 86. Second window 86 is depicted as a nine window summary of the document and may contain reduced images (Column 13, lines 55-62), which meet the limitation of receiving an image of a document index, the document index comprising a plurality of graphic representations of documents, wherein each graphic representation uniquely identifies a document.

Office Action dated January 25, 2008, page. 4.

Klotz merely describes a document surrogate that contains summaries of documents. Each document summary includes three components: a selection box, a first window, and a second window. *See Klotz*, col. 13, lines 52-58. In Klotz, “a document catalog is a document surrogate that contains summaries of more than one document.” Klotz, col. 13, lines 53-55 (emphasis added). This is not the same as a “document index comprising a plurality of graphic representations of documents, wherein each graphic representation uniquely identifies a document.” As claimed in the present application, each graphic representation uniquely identifies a single document. Therefore, Klotz does not show

“receiving an image of a document index, the document index comprising a plurality of graphic representations of documents, wherein each graphic representation uniquely identifies a document.”

As discussed above, the aforementioned references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 1, 42, 44 and 63 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art. Claims 2-6, 20, 27-32, 35-41, 43, 45-49, 54-55, 59-62, 64-68, and 73-74 depend from claims 1, 42, 44 and 63, respectively. Additionally, claims 2-6, 20, 27-32, 35-41, 43, 45-49, 54-55, 59-62, 64-68, and 73-74 recite features not disclosed by the cited art. Thus, Applicant submit that claims 2-6, 20, 27-32, 35-41, 43, 45-49, 54-55, 59-62, 64-68, and 73-74 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) In View of Davies, Klotz, Cooper and Cotte

In the 5th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 7-18, 21-26, 33-34, 50-53, 56-58, 69-72, and 75-79 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Davies and Klotz and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,680,223 (“Cooper”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,499,108 (“Cotte”). This rejection is now traversed.

As discussed above, Davies fails to teach or suggest several aspects of the claimed invention. Namely, Davies does not teach or suggest “determining that the first sticker specifies a first action to be performed on the first stored document based on a location of the first sticker with respect to the first graphic representation” nor does Davies teach or suggest “receiving an image of a document index, the document index comprising a plurality of

graphic representations of documents, wherein each graphic representation uniquely identifies a document.” Also, as discussed above, Klotz fails to remedy the deficiencies of Davies.

Further, neither Cooper nor Cotte remedy the deficiencies of Davies and Klotz. Specifically, neither Cotte nor Cooper disclose features to support the manipulation of collections of stored documents.

Cooper merely describes techniques for assigning a file label to a file. A relationship is established between an image domain file label and a file name assigned by the computer, so that the label can be employed to assist the user in identifying the file. In particular, Cooper does not provide any hint or suggestion of receiving an image of a document index wherein the document index comprises a plurality of representation of documents. The instruction form disclosed in Cooper is not a type of document index, but rather is a page for providing information about the document following the instruction form, where the information is an image file label of the document or processing instructions for the document. *See* Cooper, col. 9, lines 21-30; FIG. 4, item 62; col. 3, lines 46-55.

Cotte is solely directed to the recognition of command symbols, merely describing symbol recognition software for recognizing symbols on a document to be scanned which indicate whether the document is to be faxed, sent as e-mail, and the like (col. 11, lines 28-30), and does not disclose an image of a document index. Cotte teaches the use of stickers that can be placed on the document to be processed, and further describes “hot zones” for stickers in which the recognition software looks for attributes such as fax phone numbers and the like (col. 12, lines 5-9). However, Cotte fails to describe any technique for identifying a target based on the location of the sticker on the documents as claimed herein.

Further, Cooper is directed to the manipulation of electronic documents through the use of special purpose cover forms which specify actions such as labeling, retrieving and storing. Cotte is directed to a system in which the software of the input device recognizes special commands to issue to a computer based on pre-defined command symbols and auxiliary symbols contained within a scanned document.

Both Cotte and Cooper fail to disclose “receiving an image of a document index, the document index comprising a plurality of graphic representations of documents, wherein each graphic representation uniquely identifies a document,” an integral feature for the manipulation of stored collections of documents. Cooper does disclose the use of special cover forms with check boxes for marking off documents and special fields for handwritten labels (*see* Cooper FIG. 9. and col. 3 lines 46-50). However, Cooper is directed to the generation of special cover forms containing handwritten labels (document image domains) and checkboxes representing stored documents that are pre-selected by the user for manipulation, not of an image of document index. Col. 4, lines 6-12 of Cooper state, “According to this aspect, a user would request a listing of the labels of an appropriate set of files which are stored on or accessible to the computer. In response to the request for the listing, the computer generates a display of the image domain in file label, if any, and possibly other indications, for each file.”

Thus, both Cotte and Cooper fail to disclose “determining that the first sticker specifies a first action to be performed on the first stored document based on a location of the first sticker with respect to the first graphic representation.” and also both Cooper and Cooper fail to disclose “an image of a document index, the document index comprising a

plurality of graphic representations of documents, wherein each graphic representation uniquely identifies a document.”

As discussed above, neither Cooper nor Cotte disclose a document index image upon which to adhere stickers. Cooper further **teaches away** from the use of stickers to specify actions, instead using special purpose forms for different types of actions to perform upon selected documents represented by their name or image label (see FIG. 4, FIG. 9, FIG. 12).

Accordingly, neither Cooper nor Cotte disclose “determining that the first sticker specifies a first action to be performed on the first stored document based on a location of the first sticker with respect to the first graphic representation”. Cotte does not disclose either a document index or a graphic representation. In Cooper, actions to be performed upon documents are determined from user selection of check boxes (see FIG. 4, FIG. 9, FIG. 12).

Claims 1, 42, 44 and 63 have been shown above to be patentably distinguishable over Davies. Claims 7-18, 21-26, 33-34, 50-53, 56-28, 69-72, and 75-79 depend from claims 1, 42, 44 and 63. For at least the reasons above, neither Cotte nor Cooper remedy the deficiencies of Davies. Additionally, claims 7-18, 21-26, 33-34, 50-53, 56-28, 69-72, and 75-79 recite features not disclosed by the cited art. Thus, Applicant submit that claims 7-18, 21-26, 33-34, 50-53, 56-28, 69-72, and 75-79 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now pending are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons given above, while not necessarily conceding any contention not specifically addressed. Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections of these claims and request allowance of them.

If the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicants' attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully Submitted,
JOHN BARRUS ET AL.

Date: April 25, 2008

By: /Kanda Ishihara/
Attorneys for Assignee
Kanda Ishihara, Reg. No. 56,607
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7805
Fax: (650) 938-5200